



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the testator, it is generally supposed that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the act. If not, the instrument is promptly attacked and the attempt made to "break" it under one pretense or the other.

And who will doubt that if in any large locality to-day, or if in any large society of men, a church or secret order, the custom should grow up to disinherit children or wife and bestow the property on strangers, that the legislature or the courts would not at once step in and deny such right to the individual?

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

AGAIN "THE ETHICS OF MIRACLES"

WEST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY, *July 9, 1913.*

DEAR EDITOR,—Kindly permit me to reply to the article, "The Ethics of Miracles," in the June number of the REVIEW. The writer objects to miracles, on the ground of their partiality to some and injustice to others. But the same objection can be urged against the most frequent and universal laws of nature. Reference was made by the writer of the article to the "miraculous draught of fishes." Two fishermen are favored, the others are not; this is unjust. But does not nature endow some men with the ability to catch fish, while others are not so endowed? Is such a condition wrong, or unjust? It is not a question of ethics. It is not a question of justice, or injustice.

The blind man is referred to, and his healing is a partiality which is condemned. But nature is constantly working out the same kind of acts. Some children are born blind; some are not. It is not a question of ethics.

The widow of Nain lost her son and his being brought back to life was a partiality. Again, Nature works her same kind of partialities. There are homes remaining unbroken for years; other homes are always in mourning.

The objection to miracles from the ethical standpoint, from the standpoint of "ought such things to be?" can be urged against conditions of human life which have always manifested inequalities. One child is born inheriting a strong body and capable mind; another inherits the very opposite. It is not an unethical situation. It is non-ethical. It does not belong to the sphere of ethics.

Whether the miracles of Jesus be historically true, is one of question. The solution of that question is not furthered by considering it from the ethical point of view.

If there be a personal God, then the present inequalities of life exist by His permission and arrangement. If the personal God once chose to work by miracle, that also was His arrangement. Ethics pertains to one no more than to the other. They both are non-ethical conditions.

I am, dear sir,

J. M. CORUM, JR.